

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 18 and 19 are amended. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-31 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview on December 11, 2009, during which the Examiner proposed claim amendments for placing the claims in a condition for allowance. However, Applicants believe a broader scope of the invention is patentable in view of the prior art of record.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 18 and 19 have been amended to incorporate some of the features previously recited in claim 3¹. However, these features have been previously considered by the Examiner in the previous Office Actions and were even proposed by the Examiner in the Examiner's Amendment discussed on December 11, 2009 (see Interview Summary mailed January 22, 2010). Accordingly, **Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments** as they do not raise new issues and no additional search and/or consideration is required.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rumreich et al. (US 5,929,927; hereinafter "Rumreich"). Independent claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18 and 19 have been amended to incorporate some of the features of claim 3. Applicants traverse this rejection based on the following comments.

¹ Which are removed from claim 3 by this Amendment.

Amended claim 1 recites:

A scroll display control device including a computer readable medium which stores a program for causing a computer to execute scroll-displaying, in synchronism with reproduction of series information correlated to text information, the corresponding text information on a text display screen, said scroll display control device comprising:

means which changes a scroll speed in said text display screen on the basis of a text quantity of said corresponding text information with respect to reproduction time of said series information,

wherein the display area of said text is fixed at a predetermined reference position of the text display screen,

wherein a scroll speed calculation means calculates said scroll speed of the text on the basis of a time length of a series information section being reproduced, a quantity of the text belonging to a text section corresponding to said series information section, and text display setting information.

Applicants submit that Rumreich does not disclose that “scroll-displaying, in synchronism with reproduction of series information correlated to text information, the corresponding text information on a text display screen...a scroll speed calculation means calculates said scroll speed of the text on the basis of a time length of a series information section being reproduced, a quantity of the text belonging to a text section corresponding to said series information section, and text display setting information,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner appears to assume that the fullness of the buffer changes in synchronization with a reproduction time instant of the text (*see* Rumreich, col. 6, lines 38-60). However, this assumption is not correct. This is because, in a case of broadcast on, the text of closed captioning is displayed after a lapse of a time interval, which can be between several seconds and several tens of seconds, from a time instant when a person actually speaks. Accordingly, due to this delay, the fullness of a buffer cannot be in synchronization with the

reproduction time instant of text information (i.e., a time instant when the person actually speaks the contents of the text).

Accordingly, even if in Rumreich the scroll speed is merely controlled by the fullness of the buffer, it is impossible to realize control of the scroll speed so as to match a text quantity of text information corresponding to the reproduction time instant of the text. Therefore, Rumreich does not disclose “scroll-displaying, in synchronism with reproduction of series information correlated to text information, the corresponding text information on a text display screen...a scroll speed calculation means calculates said scroll speed of the text on the basis of...a quantity of the text belonging to a text section corresponding to said series information section,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that Rumreich discloses control of the scroll speed matched with the reproduction time instant because as the amount of text available for display increases, the rate of scrolling increases (col. 5, lines 2-3). However, the closed captioning is not in synchronization with the reproduction time instant of pictures because of the reasons et forth above. That is, in the case of closed captioning there is a delay between the time a person actually speaks and the time the spoken text is actually displayed. Therefore, the displayed text is never truly in sync with the reproduction of series information. Accordingly, an apparatus of Rumreich cannot achieve a remarkable effect of the present invention where it is possible to scroll-display the text in perfect synchronism with the pictures or series information (i.e., in synchronism with words which a speaker talks).

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Rumreich does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1, and therefore, claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

To the extent independent claims 2, 10, 11, 18 and 19 recite similar features to those recited in claim 1, claims 2, 10, 11, 18 and 19 should be also deemed allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, Applicant submits that the remaining dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan F. Heavener/

Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 26, 2010